UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,312	11/09/2001	Jun-Il Hong	678-0625	7218

66547 7590 06/01/2009

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP
290 Broadhollow Road
Suite 210E
Melville, NY 11747

EXAMINER	
ZHOU, TING	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/038,312	HONG, JUN-IL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TING ZHOU	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 23 March 2009 have been received and entered. Claims 1-5 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard U.S. Patent 5,898,432 and Horwitz et al. U.S. Patent 5,774,866 (hereinafter "Horwitz").

Referring to claim 1, Pinard teaches a method comprising the steps of registering one of the plurality of functions to the related individual state indicator corresponding to a current state change, when the state change to be reflected in a state representation of the related individual state indicator occurs (upon occurrence of a change in a state representation of the related individual state indicator occurs, i.e. when the appearance of the cursor icon changes due to a state change such as receipt of a new state, i.e. incoming telephone call, email, fax, etc., a new function corresponding to the incoming telephone call, email, fax, etc. is registered to the cursor) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55); altering the state representation of the related individual state indicator corresponding to the current state change (changing the appearance of the cursor when a state change such as receipt of a call, email, fax,

etc. occurs) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55; this is further shown in Figures 2-5); and invoking the registered function upon receipt of a user input (action by the user of executing the invoked function of the cursor, i.e. user action of answering the telephone upon the display of the cursor indicating a telephone call, user running an application program to access an email upon the display of the cursor indicating a waiting email message, etc.) (Pinard: column 4, lines 5-55). However, Pinard fails to explicitly teach invoking the registered function upon receipt of a user input for designating the individual state indicator. Horwitz teaches a method for the display of status indicators (such as the display of the alarm status flashing icon when conflicting search results are found) (Horwitz: column 21, lines 1-15) similar to that of Pinard. In addition, Horwitz further teaches invoking the registered function of the state indicator upon receipt of a user input for designating the individual state indicator (the registered function of displaying selected information associated with the alarm status flashing icon, i.e. a list of potential matters which produced the conflicts, is invoked if the user selects the alarm status flashing icon) (Horwitz: column 21, lines 1-15 and 26-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pinard and Horwitz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method for registering a function to an indicator of Pinard to include the use of executing the associated function upon selection of the icon taught by Horwitz. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow users to respond to important indicator events such as alarms in a timely, convenient and user-friendly manner.

Referring to claim 2, Pinard teaches a method comprising the steps of registering one of the plurality of functions to the related individual state indicator corresponding to a current state

change when the state change to be reflected in a state representation of the related individual state indicator occurs (upon occurrence of a change in a state representation of the related individual state indicator occurs, i.e. when the appearance of the cursor icon changes due to a state change such as receipt of a new state, i.e. incoming telephone call, email, fax, etc., a new function corresponding to the incoming telephone call, email, fax, etc. is registered to the cursor) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55), altering the state representation of the related individual state indicator corresponding to the current state change (changing the appearance of the cursor when a state change such as receipt of a call, email, fax, etc. occurs) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55; this is further shown in Figures 2-5), and invoking the registered one of the plurality of functions upon receipt of a user input (action by the user of executing the invoked function of the cursor, i.e. user action of answering the telephone upon the display of the cursor indicating a telephone call, user running an application program to access an email upon the display of the cursor indicating a waiting email message, etc.) (Pinard: column 4, lines 5-55). However, Pinard fails to explicitly teach determining whether coordinates of a touch screen input indicate that a representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched upon receipt of the touch screen input and invoking the registered one of the plurality of functions when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate that the representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched. Horwitz teaches a method for the display of status indicators (such as the display of the alarm status flashing icon when conflicting search results are found) (Horwitz: column 21, lines 1-15) similar to that of Pinard. In addition, Horwitz further teaches determining whether the coordinates of a touch screen input indicate the representation area of the individual state

indicator upon receipt of the touch screen input and invoking the registered function when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate the representation area of the individual state indicator (the registered function of displaying selected information associated with the alarm status flashing icon, i.e. a list of potential matters which produced the conflicts, is invoked if it has been determined that the user input is the user selection of the alarm status flashing icon; user input to make selections can be received via a touch screen input to make onscreen selections) (Horwitz: column 9, lines 2-6 and column 21, lines 1-15 and 26-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pinard and Horwitz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method for registering a function to an indicator of Pinard to include the use of executing the associated function upon touch screen selection of the icon taught by Horwitz. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow users to respond to important indicator events such as alarms in a timely, convenient and user-friendly manner.; furthermore, it would have been advantageous to make such a combination in order to avoid the inconvenience of attaching a mouse or keyboard to devices that are small in size, such as handheld devices like PDAs and cell phones.

Referring to claim 3, Pinard teaches a method comprising the steps of registering one of the plurality of functions to the related individual state indicator corresponding to a current state change when the state change to be reflected in a state representation of the related individual state indicator occurs (upon occurrence of a change in a state representation of the related individual state indicator occurs, i.e. when the appearance of the cursor icon changes due to a state change such as receipt of a new state, i.e. incoming telephone call, email, fax, etc., a new function corresponding to the incoming telephone call, email, fax, etc. is registered to the cursor)

(Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55), altering the state representation of the related individual state indicator corresponding to the current state change (changing the appearance of the cursor when a state change such as receipt of a call, email, fax, etc. occurs) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55; this is further shown in Figures 2-5), and invoking the registered function upon receipt of a user input (action by the user of executing the invoked function of the cursor, i.e. user action of answering the telephone upon the display of the cursor indicating a telephone call, user running an application program to access an email upon the display of the cursor indicating a waiting email message, etc.) (Pinard: column 4, lines 5-55). However, Pinard fails to explicitly teach determining whether a cursor or an input focus is positioned over a representation area of the related individual state indicator upon receipt of a user button input, and invoking the registered function when the cursor or input focus is positioned over the representation area of the related individual state indicator. Horwitz teaches a method for the display of status indicators (such as the display of the alarm status flashing icon when conflicting search results are found) (Horwitz: column 21, lines 1-15) similar to that of Pinard. In addition, Horwitz further teaches determining whether a cursor or an input focus is positioned over a representation area of the individual state indicator upon receipt of a user button input (determining if the user has selected the icon through the input means) (Horwitz: column 9, lines 2-6 and column 21, lines 11-15), and invoking the registered function when the cursor or input focus is positioned over the representation area of the individual state indicator (the registered function of displaying selected information associated with the alarm status flashing icon, i.e. a list of potential matters which produced the conflicts, is invoked if the user selects the alarm status flashing icon) (Horwitz: column 21, lines

1-15 and 26-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pinard and Horwitz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method for registering a function to an indicator of Pinard to include the use of executing the associated function upon selection of the icon taught by Horwitz. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow users to respond to important indicator events such as alarms in a timely, convenient and user-friendly manner.

Referring to claim 4, Pinard teaches a method comprising the steps of registering an individual message reading function of the plurality of functions to a related individual message state indicator when the message arrives (upon occurrence of a change in a state representation of the related individual state indicator occurs, i.e. when the appearance of the cursor icon changes to a message envelope due to a state change such as receipt of a new email, a new function of an email message indicator is registered to the cursor) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55); displaying an alteration of a representation of the related individual message state indicator corresponding to the message arrival (changing the appearance of the cursor to display a message indicator, i.e. an email message indicator when a state change such as receipt of a new message /mail is occurs) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55; this is further shown in Figures 2-5), and invoking the message reading function upon receipt of a user input (action by the user of executing the invoked function of the cursor, i.e. user action of answering the telephone upon the display of the cursor indicating a telephone call, user running an application program to access an email upon the display of the cursor indicating a waiting email message, etc.) (Pinard: column 4, lines 5-55). However, Pinard fails to explicitly teach determining whether coordinates of a touch

screen input indicate that a representation area of the related individual message state indicator has been touched, upon receipt of the touch screen input; and invoking the message reading function when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate that the representation area of the related individual message state indicator has been touched. Horwitz teaches a method for the display of status indicators (such as the display of the alarm status flashing icon when conflicting search results are found) (Horwitz: column 21, lines 1-15) similar to that of Pinard. In addition, Horwitz further teaches determining whether coordinates of a touch screen input indicate that a representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched upon receipt of the touch screen input and invoking the function when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate that the representation area of the individual state indicator has been touched (the registered function of displaying selected information associated with the alarm status flashing icon, i.e. a list of potential matters which produced the conflicts, is invoked if it has been determined that the user input is the user selection of the alarm status flashing icon; user input to make selections can be received via a touch screen input to make onscreen selections) (Horwitz: column 9, lines 2-6 and column 21, lines 1-15 and 26-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pinard and Horwitz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method for registering a message reading function to an indicator of Pinard to include the use of executing the associated function upon touch screen selection of the icon taught by Horwitz. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow users to respond to important indicator events such as alarms in a timely, convenient and user-friendly manner.; furthermore, it would have been advantageous to

make such a combination in order to avoid the inconvenience of attaching a mouse or keyboard to devices that are small in size, such as handheld devices like PDAs and cell phones.

Referring to claim 5, Pinard teaches a method comprising the steps of registering an alarm function from among the plurality of functions to the related individual alarm state indicator when the alarm is set (upon occurrence of a change in a state representation of the related individual state indicator occurs, i.e. when the appearance of the cursor icon changes to an alarm due to a state change such as receipt of a signal indicating an alarm, a new function of an alarm indicator is registered to the cursor) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55), displaying an alteration of a representation of the related individual alarm state indicator corresponding to the alarm being set (changing the appearance of the cursor to display an alarm indicator upon the occurrence of the alarm) (Pinard: column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55; this is further shown in Figures 2-5), and invoking an alarm function upon receipt of a user input (action by the user of executing the invoked function of the cursor, i.e. user action of answering the telephone upon the display of the cursor indicating a telephone call, user running an application program to access an email upon the display of the cursor indicating a waiting email message, etc.) (Pinard: column 4, lines 5-55). However, Pinard fails to explicitly teach determining whether coordinates of a touch screen input indicate that a representation area of the related individual alarm state indicator has been touched upon receipt of the touch screen input and invoking the individual alarm function when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate that the representation area of the related individual alarm state indicator has been touched. Horwitz teaches a method for the display of status indicators (such as the display of the alarm status flashing icon when conflicting search results are found) (Horwitz:

column 21, lines 1-15) similar to that of Pinard. In addition, Horwitz further teaches determining whether coordinates of a touch screen input indicate a representation area of the individual state indicator upon receipt of the touch screen input and invoking the alarm function when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate the representation area of the individual state indicator (the registered function of displaying selected information associated with the alarm status flashing icon, i.e. a list of potential matters which produced the conflicts, is invoked if it has been determined that the user input is the user selection of the alarm status flashing icon; user input to make selections can be received via a touch screen input to make onscreen selections) (Horwitz: column 9, lines 2-6 and column 21, lines 1-15 and 26-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pinard and Horwitz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method for registering an alarm function to an indicator of Pinard to include the use of executing the associated function upon touch screen selection of the icon taught by Horwitz. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow users to respond to important indicator events such as alarms in a timely, convenient and user-friendly manner.; furthermore, it would have been advantageous to make such a combination in order to avoid the inconvenience of attaching a mouse or keyboard to devices that are small in size, such as handheld devices like PDAs and cell phones.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 3/23/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive: The applicant argues that Pinard teaches that a cursor form is changed and it is

merely used to indicate that a certain event is newly occurring, and not that a function corresponding to an occurrence of the event is registered to a corresponding cursor, i.e. registering one of the plurality of functions to the related individual state indicator that corresponds to a current state change, and therefore, because the function corresponding to an occurrence of the event is not registered to a corresponding cursor, the cursor cannot be used to operate a related function corresponding to occurrence of the event. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to the applicant's argument that Pinard only teaches that a cursor form is changed to indicate the occurrence of an event, instead of a function registered to the state indicator, the examiner respectfully refers to the BPAI's Decision issued on 8/29/2008 (i.e. on page 3, the board states: "According to Pinard, a single cursor 23 in figure 3 has different changeable forms or representations as icon 25 in figures 3 through 5 and correspondingly different functions that may be invoked by the user for each of them"). Pinard teaches a plurality of functions associated with a single indicator, i.e. a single cursor is associated with a plurality of functions such as the function of a telephone indicator icon upon occurrence of a telephone call, the function of a message indicator upon the occurrence of an email message, etc., as recited in column 1, line 59-column 2, line 10 and column 4, line 11-55. Figures 3-5 of Pinard each shows a different function of the cursor 25; Figure 3 shows the function of indicating the arrival of a telephone call; Figure 4 shows the function of indicating the arrival of an email message; and Figure 5 shows the function of indicating a new fax message. Therefore, Pinard teaches a plurality of functions related to a single indicator, i.e. the functions of indicating a new phone call, a new email message, and a new fax message are registered with the indicator of the cursor

icon 25. Furthermore, Pinard explicitly recites, on column 1, lines 53-55: "the cursor itself changes to an icon or to include an icon related to the function".

In view of the above, the examiner respectfully asserts that Pinard teaches registering a function to the related individual state indicator that corresponds to a current state change.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TING ZHOU whose telephone number is (571)272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kieu Vu can be reached on (571) 272-4057. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ting Zhou/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173